Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (Initial)

Report No: AC151

Section I - Basic Information

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 07/11/2003

A. Basic Project Data (from PDS)

I.A.1. Project Statistics

Country: INDIA	Project ID: P078536
Project: Agricultural Higher Education Reforms Project	Task Team Leader: Shashi K. Shrivastava
Authorized to Appraise Date: January 6, 2004	IBRD Amount (\$m): 80.00
Bank Approval: March 30, 2004	IDA Amount (\$m): 80.00
Managing Unit: SASHD	Sector: Tertiary education (60%); Agricultural
Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan (SIL)	extension and research (40%)
Status: Lending	Theme: Education for the knowledge economy (P);
	Rural services and infrastructure (S)

I.A.2. Project Objectives (From PDS):

Agricultural higher education system achieves excellence, enhanced relevance, and high efficiency; and agricultural universities offer enhanced services of benefit to farmers and rural women.

I.A.3. Project Description (From PDS):

The project would focus on major reforms in institutional governance, financing, academic quality and relevance in selected Agricultural universities in India. Governance and financial reforms will aim at providing greater freedom to universities for improved efficiency, accountability and private-public partnership. *Academic reforms* will concentrate primarily on (a) consolidation and modernization of existing undergraduate programs for greater relevance and reorientation towards knowledge, skills and attitude demanded by the changing labor market environment, and (b) promotion of excellence in selected critical/emerging areas at the postgraduate education and research levels. Extension services would be strengthened not only for enhanced outreach specially to farmers, unemployed youth and rural women but also for transferring skills to them that would increase their earning capacity. Closer linkages among institutions, industry and R&D organizations would be encouraged. *Systemic reforms* would focus on improved manpower planning, global technology watch, continued curriculum upgradation to meet emerging needs, strengthening management capacity, improving quality assurance mechanisms, increasing systemic efficiency, and strengthening monitoring and evaluation capacity at different levels.

The Project development objective would be achieved through two components with distinct modes of funding. Under the first component - *Institutional Development* - institutions would be funded through a <u>selection mechanism</u>. *Selection criteria will be developed during project preparation -- these will reflect institutions' willingness to reform, and their potential and vision for development*. This component would support (a) restructuring and modernization of undergraduate programs in various specializations; (b) promotion of academic excellence in critical/emerging areas at postgraduate and doctoral levels; (c) increasing scope and effectiveness of networking with educational institutions and research organizations within India and abroad; and (d) enhancing reach and effectiveness of institutional extension services to agribusiness,

farmers and rural women.

The second component on *Systemic Reforms* - funded in a noncompetitive investment mode - would include (a) enhancement of management capacity and improvements in administrative processes in institutions and ICAR's Education Division; (b) ensuring compliance with ICAR's quality assurance policies, criteria and procedures; and strengthening accreditation and quality monitoring capacity; (c) increasing system internal efficiency; and (d) strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) capacity at different levels.

Efforts would be made to increase public-private partnership in agricultural education through (a) the increased role of the private sector in curriculum design, research and development and institute governance, and (b) providing a window for direct project support for specific initiatives by the private sector in offering training opportunities for agricultural graduates.

I.A.4. Project Location: (Geographic location, information about the key environmental and social characteristics of the area and population likely to be affected, and proximity to any protected areas, or sites or critical natural habitats, or any other culturally or socially sensitive areas.)

Existing State Agricultural Universities and Deemed Universities are located in/near large cities. Most of these universities are residential. The main beneficiaries would be students. The universities will also provide technical services to farmers seeking such help. None of the location is near culturally or socially sensitive areas or any natural habitats.

B. Check Environmental Classification: B (Partial Assessment)

Comments: No acquisition of land or major construction activity is planned. Only minor extensions or refurbishment of existing university buildings would be supported under the project. All project activities would be confined to university campuses and their extension centers. Any construction-related impacts would be mitigated or managed by the use of specific guidelines or codes of environmental practice, and careful management of the building activities. The waste management practices from university laboratories and work stations would be clearly assessed and improved as necessary. ICAR would also undertake a quick assessment of the pattern and scale of the use of different pesticides, chemical and pathological agents and mediums in the laboratories and university research and teaching farms.

C. Safeguard Policies Triggered (from PDS)

(click on for a detailed description *or* click on the policy number for a brief description)

Policy	Triggered
Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01, BP 4.01, GP 4.01)	● Yes ○ No ○ TBD
Natural Habitats (OP 4.04, BP 4.04, GP 4.04)	○ Yes ● No ○ TBD
Forestry (OP 4.36, GP 4.36)	○ Yes ● No ○ TBD
Pest Management (OP 4.09)	○ Yes ○ No ● TBD
Cultural Property (OPN 11.03)	○ Yes ● No ○ TBD
Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)	○ Yes ● No ○ TBD
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	○ Yes ● No ○ TBD
Safety of Dams (OP 4.37, BP 4.37)	○ Yes ● No ○ TBD
-	i

Projects in International Waters (OP 7.50, BP 7.50, GP 7.50)	O Yes	● No	\bigcirc TBD
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP 7.60, BP 7.60, GP 7.60)*	O Yes	No	○ TBD

Section II - Key Safeguard Issues and Their Management

D. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues. Please fill in all relevant questions. If information is not available, describe steps to be taken to obtain necessary data.

II.D.1a. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts.

OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment is triggered since the project will be supporting construction, laboratories, and agricultural extension activities. The applicability of OP 4.09 on Pest Management will be determined during the first project preparation mission after assessing the likely use of WHO Class I and II pesticides. O.P. 4.20 on Indigneous People (IP) is not triggered because the project is concerned with improvements in the quality of educational provision and not with access to that education. However, to ensure the inclusiveness of IP and other vulnerable communities in reaching the benefits of the project, the relevance of the approach used in the Tribal Development Plan prepared for the earlier Technical Education and Quality Improvement Program will be examined and incorporated as part of the project design. The project does not involve any land acquisition or involuntary resettlement. The project would not cause any large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts.

II.D.1b. Describe any potential cumulative impacts due to application of more than one safeguard policy or due to multiple project component.

None

II.D.1c Describe any potential long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area. None

II.D.2. In light of 1, describe the proposed treatment of alternatives (if required) Not applicable

II.D.3. Describe arrangement for the borrower to address safeguard issues

The Borrower would be requested to prepare the following: (a) Environmental Codes of Practice (ECOP) to be included in the construction guidelines; (b)Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for the safe handling and disposal of laboratory waste; and (c) SOP for the safe storage, transportation and use of toxic chemicals and substances, and (d) improved pest management practices. (Note: a guideline is already in use for pesticide management, which would be evaluated and improved, if required). The implementing institutions would adhere to or implement these guidelines/strategies or plans.

Further, environmental issues and concerns, including integrated pest management and improved plant nutrition management, would be reflected in the revised curricula and in extension services provided by universities.

II.D.4. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on

safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people. To be determined during project preparation.

E. Safeguards Classification (select in SAP). Category is determined by the highest impact in any policy. Or on basis of cumulative impacts from multiple safeguards. Whenever an individual safeguard policy is triggered the provisions of that policy apply.

- [] S1. Significant, cumulative and/or irreversible impacts; or significant technical and institutional risks in management of one or more safeguard areas
- [X] S2. One or more safeguard policies are triggered, but effects are limited in their impact and are technically and institutionally manageable
- [] S3. No safeguard issues
- [] SF. Financial intermediary projects, social development funds, community driven development or similar projects which require a safeguard framework or programmatic approach to address safeguard issues.

F. Disclosure Requirements

1. Disclosure Requirements	_	
Environmental Assessment/Analysis/Management Plan:	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	10/31/2003	
Date of "in-country" disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		
Date of distributing the Exec. Summary of the EA to the Executive		
Directors (For category A projects)		
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework:	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of "in-country" disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop	_	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework:	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of "in-country" disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop	_	
Pest Management Plan:	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank		
Date of "in-country" disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		
Dam Safety Management Plan:	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of "in-country" disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why.

Signed and submitted by

Name

Date

Task Team Leader:	Shashi K. Shrivastava	06/18/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 1:	David J. Marsden	06/18/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 2:	Tapas Paul	06/18/2003

Project Safeguards Specialists 3:

Approved by:	Name	Date
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	L. Panneer Selvam	07/11/2003
Sector Manager/Director	Michelle Riboud	07/11/2003